DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 860 CG 011 326

AUTHOR Fisher, Ronald J.
TITLE Measuring Intergroup Attitudes in Community Settings.
PUB DATE [74]
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association (Toronto, Ontario, Canada, June 9-11, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; Cognitive Processes; *Community Attitudes; Evaluation Methods; *Group Relations; *Intergroup Relations; *Interviews; Program Descriptions; Psychological Studies; *Rating Scales; Relationship; Social Psychology

ABSTRACT

Contemporary social psychology takes a simplistic approach to the conceptualization and measurement of intergroup attitudes. Most definitions involve only the affective component of attitudes, and most measurement devices are restricted self-report, paper and pencil questionnaires. A broader and more flexible approach is required to adequately gauge the impact of attitude change interventions in complex community settings. A detailed description is given of the development of an interview and rating scale procedure designed to comprehensively assess the attitudinal properties of cognitive complexity, affective positiveness, and behavioral orientations. Descriptions of the questions, definitions of the rating scales, and details of the rating process are provided. Results from two attitude change studies in community settings demonstrate satisfactory interrater reliabilities. The rating scales generally exhibit homogeneity within the three main areas and independence among the areas. Factor analysis of rating scores yielded moderate indications of three main factors corresponding to the three attitudinal properties. With further testing and refinement, the procedure is recommended for the assessment of attitudes on dimensions which have significance for real world behavior. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED138860

Measuring Intergroup Attitudes in Community Settings

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Ronald J. Fisher [1]

University of Saskatchewan

The concept of attitude probably evidences more definitions than any other in social psychology. The definitions vary as to whether attitude is seen as comprised of one component (the affective or evaluative), two components (the affective and the cognitive), or three components (the affective, the cognitive, and the behavioral). The single-component definitions (e.g., Bem, 1970: Insko & Schopler, 1972) appear to be gaining in popularity over the two-component definitions (e.g., Jones & Garard, 1967; Rosenberg, 1960) and also the more complex three-component definitions (Katz & Stotland, 1959; Krech, Crutchfield & Ballachey, 1962). This apparent shift toward conceptual simplicity is paralleled by a preference for simplification in the measurement of attitudes in terms of components assessed and types of responses allowed. Baron, Byrne & Griffit, after adopting a single-component definition, state:

> ... the most frequently used measures of attitudes involve attempts to assess only positive and negative evaluations of attitude objects. Most attitude measurement techniques do not systematically assess the cognitive and/or behavioral components included in the multiple-component definitions (1974, p.168).

In addition, attitude measurement continues to show a strong preponderance of fixed-response instruments which allow the respondent to indicate only the direction and magnitude of the affective component.

CG011326

In an incidental sample of ten recent social psychology textbooks, only three provide comprehensive coverage of attitude measurement, and four of the ten do not even discuss the measurement process. Given the centrality of the concept of attitude in the field of social psychology, this lack of emphasis on measurement, and the corresponding dearth of new measurement devices beyond fixed-response questionnaires, are regarded as most unfortunate.

The problem of simplistic measurement becomes crucial when assessing attitude change efforts in real world settings where a more comprehensive evaluation is required to gauge the full effects of an intervention, and where respondents may reject the use of fixed-response techniques. In this situation, the more complex three-component definitions, and more comprehensive measurement techniques derived from them, are clearly more desirable. Each of the three attitude components embodies a property which appears to have important implications for positive attitude change and improved intergroup relations, i.e., conflict prevention and resolution. The complexity of the cognitive component, the magnitude of the affective component, and the overtness of the action component (Scott, 1968) appear to be qualities having practical significance as well as conceptual appeal. In order to adequately assess these properties, it is necessary to combine the advantages of both open and closed instruments into a single procedure which captures the richness and fullness of a respondent's attitudes in a reliable and meaningful quantitative form.

The purpose of this article is to describe the development of an open-ended interview and rating scale procedure for attitude measurement used in two attitude change studies (Fisher, 1972b; Fisher & White,

In Press). The attitudinal properties assessed roughly correspond to Scott's (1968) complexity, magnitude, and overtness, and were termed complexity, positiveness, and orientations. The article describes in detail the questions and rating scales, and presents initial data on reliability and inter-relationships among the ratings.

Method

The Two Studies

The two attitude change studies involved intergroup contact guided by a model of third party consultation (Fisher, 1972a). The model describes the strategies and behavior of an impartial consultant who facilitates small group discussions between antagonistic groups involved in dysfunctional social relationships. The objectives of the method include improved intergroup attitudes, an improved relationship, and conflict resolution. The evaluation design in both studies included pre and post assessments on discussion groups and non-discussion control groups.

Study One (Fisher, 1972b) focused on the relationship between students and teachers in two large high schools in the suburbs of an American metropolis. A series of small group problem-solving discussions involving students and teachers was facilitated by the consultant over a four week period. Student participants and student controls completed a set of open-ended written questions before and after the discussions. The respondents were 32 grade eleven male students with a median age of 17. Ratings derived from the question protocols were used to test the hypotheses predicting increased complexity of attitudes, increased positiveness of

attitudes, and increased orientations for improvement of the relationship.

Study Two (Fisher & White, In Press) tested the effectiveness of third party consultation for improving intergroup attitudes between members of antagonistic housing groups living in the same neighbourhood in a small Canadian city. Public housing tenants and private home owners met together in small group discussions to talk about their relationship, the neighbourhood, and the ways to improve both. Participants and control group members took part in one-hour structured interviews using open questions before and after the discussions. Respondents were 23 female and 4 male residents with a median age of 32. As in Study One, the main objective was favorable attitude change in terms of complexity, positiveness and orientations.

The Open Questions

Study One used three open written questions to cover respondents' attitudes toward teachers and the relationship between students and teachers. Written questions were used in lieu of the more expensive interview procedure even though the latter was more desirable with regard to motivation of the respondent and breadth of coverage. Study One was regarded as exploratory work directed toward a more complex attitude assessment procedure. The open questions are given in Figure 1.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Instructions explained the rationale of the open questions and urged respondents to produce answers as close to one page per question as they could within an eight minute time limit per question.

Study Two employed structured interviews consisting of open questions on the respondent's attitudes toward the neighbourhood and the relationship between the housing groups, present and future. The interview schedule without introductory or connecting statements is shown in Figure 2. Instructions provided background information on the

---

Insert Figure 2 about here

---

study and stressed respondent confidentiality and anonymity. Demographic information was also obtained.

The Rating Scale Definitions

Study One included the creation of a set of rating dimensions and coding categories relevant to the measurement of intergroup attitudes. A tentative list of dimensions was developed from an examination of literature in the areas of attitude theory and change, conflict theory, and conflict resolution including third party consultation and related problem-solving approaches. That is, an attempt was made to incorporate dimensions which would be indicators of improved attitudes and conflict reduction in intergroup relationships. The tentative list of dimensions was reduced and refined on the basis of a pretesting of the open questions in the two high schools.

The rating dimensions and coding categories were organized into the three main areas of complexity, positiveness and orientations. The first area covered the complexity with which the respondent perceived the present relationship between students and teachers including the degree of social-analytical thinking, the variety and depth of issues, and the

perceived diversity of the teacher group.

The second area assessed the degree of positiveness with which the respondent viewed the present relationship between students and teachers including the social quality of the relationship and the favorability of attitude toward teachers.

The third rating area covered the orientations which the respondent had toward the future relationship between students and teachers, and to the possibility of improving the relationship including personal involvement and commitment. Figure 3 presents the detailed rating scale defini-

---
Insert Figure 3 about here
---

tions within each rating area.

Study Two built upon the rating dimensions developed for Study One, but went further in adding dimensions relevant to the social environment, i.e., the neighbourhood, which were seen as significant to the problem-solving and community development processes inherent in Study Two. In each rating area, Study Two combined some of the more specific rating dimensions into overall perceptions of the relationship. In each of the areas of complexity and positiveness, a new dimension was added (A5 and B5). Thus, complexity was defined as the detail and sophistication with which the respondent perceived the neighbourhood, the relationship between the groups, and the other group.

The second rating area covered the positiveness with which the respondent viewed the neighbourhood and the intergroup relationship including the favorability of attitude toward the other group.

The third rating area assessed the orientations which the respondent had toward the future of the relationship and the neighbourhood including personal involvement and commitment. The resulting set of detailed rating scale definitions is presented in Figure 4.

Insert Figure 4 about here

The Rating Procedure

In both studies, a rating manual was devised which defined the basic task, discussed the common rating errors (Guilford, 1954), and provided detailed definitions and instructions for each area, dimension, and category.[2] The dimensions were represented by seven-point numerical scales.

For Study One, two raters were trained using additional answer protocols from alternate participants not included in the data analysis. The raters independently and simultaneously transformed the randomized protocols of all respondents on the two occasions (pre and post) into the rating dimensions and coding categories. The rating task was broken down into three parts corresponding to the main areas of complexity, positiveness, and orientations. A training session was held for each area and the dimensions were rated within each area before moving on to the next area. Each protocol was rated in a separate booklet with each page corresponding to a single dimension. These procedures were designed to reduce halo effects and logical errors across and within rating areas. The raters were both male university graduates in the social sciences with knowledge and experience in research methodology.

For Study Two, three practice interview protocols were used to train

a research assistant in the rating procedure. The rater worked through the randomized protocols of all interviewees on the two occasions in random order one dimension at a time, thus minimizing possible halo effects and logical errors. The rater was a graduate student in social psychology. In both studies, the raters were ignorant of the experimental design.

Analysis of the Ratings

Interrater reliability. In Study One, interrater reliability was estimated by calculating Pearson correlation coefficients (r) between the two complete sets of ratings separately for the pretest and the postest. In Study Two, the author rated a random sample of 20 interview protocols selected from the pretest and posttest together. In both cases, the coefficients were corrected for length using the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula.

Relationships within and among rating areas. In both studies, Pearson correlations were calculated between each rating dimension and the total score for that rating area. The resulting "item-total" correlations give an indication of the homogeneity of the total scores which can be used in subsequent data analysis. To assess the relationships among rating areas, correlations between total scores were computed. To give a comprehensive picture of interrelationships, the ratings from both studies were factor analyzed using a principal components analysis with varimax rotation including all factors with an eigen value greater than 1. All of the analyses were based on pretest scores, but analyses of posttest data yielded similar results throughout.

Results

To illustrate the flavor of the rating process, some edited excerpts from interview responses in Study Two are presented. The excerpts have been reduced in length with an attempt to retain the major cues which led to specific ratings. One excerpt rated low and one rated high on one dimension in each rating area are given. In the complexity area, Figure 5 presents an excerpt rated low (rating of 2—

Insert Figure 5 about here
---

very low complexity — on a 7 point scale) on dimension A2, i.e., complexity of perception of the relationship between home owners and housing tenants. An excerpt which received a 6 rating (high complexity) on dimension A2 is shown in Figure 6. This same excerpt serves to illustrate

---
Insert Figure 6 about here
---

a low rating of 1 (highly negative perception) on dimension B2 in the positiveness area — negative versus positive perception of the relationship. A relatively high rating (5 — slightly positive perception) is illustrated on dimension B2 by the excerpt presented in Figure 7. With regard to the

---
Insert Figure 7 about here
---

area of orientations, excerpts were chosen to illustrate dimension C4— low versus high personal involvement. Figure 8 presents an excerpt rated 2

Insert Figure 8 about here

(very low) on the personal involvement dimension, while Figure 9 shows

---
Insert Figure 9 about here
---

an excerpt which received a high rating of 7 (very high). The excerpts give some indication of how complex verbal material can be reduced to concise and meaningful quantitative indices.

The interrater reliabilities for Study One are presented in Table 1 which gives both the Pearson correlations (r) and the Spearman-Brown (S-B) coefficients for pretest and posttest separately. Reliabilities are provided for total scores as well.

Insert Table 1 about here

The mean S-B reliabilities for the areas of complexity and positiveness were .79 and .77 respectively. In the area of orientations, the problem-solving dimension (C2) showed zero reliability on the pretest, while the goals and ways category (C4) exhibited zero reliability on the posttest. With these two dimensions deleted, the mean S-B coefficient for orientations was .77. The interrater reliabilities for Study Two are shown in Table 2. The mean S-B coefficients for the areas of complexity, positiveness and

---
Insert Table 2 about here
---

orientations were .77, .86 and .90 respectively.

The item-total correlations for Study One and Study Two are given in Table 3. The mean coefficients for each area are included.

Insert Table 3 about here

Table 4 presents the correlations among the total scores for both Study

---
Insert Table 4 about here

One and Study Two.

The results of the factor analyses are presented in Tables 5 and 6 for Study One and Two respectively. Each table gives an abridged factor

---
Insert Table 5 and 6 about here
---

matrix which includes only factor loadings of .30 or greater. The cumulative proportions of total variance accounted for by the factors before rotation are shown at the bottom of the tables. Study One included in the response measures two additional indicators of positiveness: a ten-item, Likert-type Attitude Toward Teachers Scale (ATTS) and a twenty-item Semantic Differential on Teachers (SDT), both of which were regarded as typical measures of affective magnitude. The total scores for these scales were included in the factor analysis presented in Table 5.

Discussion

In general the results give encouragement to the development of more comprehensive and meaningful measures of intergroup attitudes. However, the results must be regarded only as initial suggestive descriptions due to the small N of both studies, and the possible violations of statistical assumptions in using parametric techniques. In contrast to these concerns, it is evident that the results for every analysis do replicate across the two studies.

The interrater reliabilities are generally satisfactory. The lack of reliability on two of the orientations dimensions in Study One appears to be overcome in Study Two where a larger amount of response information was available to the raters. The area of positiveness shows especially high reliabilities, thus indicating that global assessments of magnitude are possible on single dimensions. The reliabilities indicate that given detailed definitions and instructions, raters can reliably transform complex and varied responses into manageable quantitative data.

The correlations between single dimensions and total scores by and large show that the rating areas "hang together". Most of the mean item-total correlations are acceptable given the relatively small number of items and cases included in each analysis. The correlations among total scores merit particular attention. The indications are that complexity and positiveness, and orientations and positiveness, may be independent of each other. Thus, knowing the affective magnitude of a person's attitude tells us nothing about how complex his related cognitions are, or how strong his predispositions for action may be. Both of these qualities have important implications for attitude change and intergroup conflict resolution, and need to be taken into account in complex, problem-solving activities. The significant relationship between complexity and orientations in both studies indicates that the detail and sophistication of a person's thinking on social relationships tends to be positively related to the strength of his orientations toward constructive social change.

The factor analyses shed more light on the relationships within and among rating areas, and on the relation among the corresponding attitudinal

properties. The factor analysis from Study One clearly shows three main factors corresponding to the three rating areas. The first factor is interpreted as a positiveness factor, accounting for 27 percent of the total variance in the rating scores. The typical measures of affective magnitude (ATTS and SDT) also load heavily on this factor, thus substantiating its interpretation. The second factor appears to be a complexity factor on which four of the six ratings have loadings of .30 or greater. Orientations shows up as the third major factor accounting for 10% of the variance with loadings on five of the seven dimensions. The remaining factors are spread over the rating areas and yield no clear interpretations, except for factor 6 which appears to be a second and less significant orientations factor. Thus, the overall picture is one of independence among the areas and a fair degree of cohesiveness within, especially for positiveness.

The results of the factor analysis for Study Two are not as clear cut. The orientations area shows up strongly as the first factor accounting for 31 per cent of the variance and having large loadings on four of the five dimensions. Positiveness splits into two factors (2 and 3) with two additional loadings on factors 4 and 6. It is probably that the greater heterogeneity here as compared to Study One is due to the mixture of referents in the ratings dimensions, i.e., the neighbourhood, the relationship, the ideal relationship, and the other group. This combination adopts the rating dimensions to the complexity of the real world situation, but does go beyond the usual definition of attitude where only a single referent is included. A similar outcome accrues in the complexity area,

where two factors are present (5 and 6), and one of the dimensions (A1) loads on neither of these. Again, the broadening of the referents may explain this outcome. More research is clearly required before reaching final conclusions on the degree of relationship within and among the attitudinal properties as assessed in this manner.

Conclusion

The interview and rating scale procedure serves as an appealing package for comprehensively assessing intergroup attitudes on dimensions assumed to be significant for the resolution of social conflict in community settings. The approach seeks to maximize the advantages of both open and closed measurement devices. The higher cost of interviewing and rating is seen as offset by the gains in respondent motivation and a more comprehensive assessment of attitudinal properties which are of practical significance. In both of the studies drawn on here, the attitudinal components reacted differentially to the attitude change interventions, and this occurrence had important consequences for understanding both the process and the outcomes of the interventions. To the degree that community practitioners wish to have impact on real world events, they will need to develop more adequate ways to assess that impact beyond the simple instruments which are the present standard. Sensitivity to the need for comprehensive evaluation is a foundation of effective practice.

FIGURE 1. Study One: The Written Questions

1. Most social relationships between groups of people involve both good and bad aspects. Would you please describe how you see the present relationship between students and teachers in this school. Describe some of the good points and some of the difficulties that you see.

2. Please describe in more detail how you see most teachers in general. Please include what ideas you have about teachers, how you feel emotionally toward teachers, and how you think you should behave toward teachers.

3. How would you like the relations between students and teachers to actually go in this school in the next few years? What would be some of the important forces shaping this relationship? Are there any ways that you would actually like to be involved this year or next year in affecting the relationship?

FIGURE 2. Study Two: The Interview Schedule

The Neighbourhood:

1. How many years have you lived in this neighbourhood?
2. How do you like living in this neighbourhood?
3. What are some (other) good things about this neighbourhood?
4. What are some (other) bad things about this neighbourhood?
5. What kind of activities do you take part in in this neighbourhood?
6. How do people get along in the neighbourhood?
7. Are there any groups or cliques in the neighbourhood?
   (If "yes", who are they?)
8. Are there any problems between groups in this neighbourhood?

The Relationship Between Private Home Owners and Public Housing Tenants:

1. How do you think private home owners and public housing tenants get along with each other in the neighbourhood?
2. What are some (other) good things about the relationship?
3. What are some (other) difficulties in the relationship?
4. What do you think causes these problems?

The Other Group:

1. What sorts of people do you think (the other group) are?
2. Why do you think they are like that?
3. How do you think you should behave toward (the other group)?
4. What do you think it would be like if you were (a member of the other group)?

Fig. 2 cont'd...

5. What are some of the problems that (members of the other group) have to live with?
6. Why do they have those problems?
7. How many (members of the other group) do you speak to every now and then?
8. How many (members of the other group) would you count as your friends?

The Ideal Relationship

1. How would you like the relationship between private home owners and public housing tenants to be?
2. How do you think that might come about?
3. What are the chances of that happening?
4. Would you like to be involved in bringing about a better relationship? (If "yes", in what ways?)
5. Do you think there are any goals that private home owners and public housing tenants share in common? (If "yes", what are the goals?)
6. What are some ways that private home owners and public housing tenants could work together to improve the relationship?

Future of the Neighbourhood:

1. What do you think this neighbourhood will be like two years from now?

Fig. 2 cont'd...

2. Why do you think it will be that way?
3. What are some (other) main forces shaping the future of the neighbourhood?
4. Do you think that you will be involved in any ways in the neighbourhood that you aren't now? (If "yes", in what ways?)

FIGURE 3. Study One: The Rating Scale Definitions

A. Complexity:

A1. Low vs. High Awareness of Joint Causality and Responsibility: the degree to which the respondent sees problems in the relationship as being jointly caused by both students and teachers, and the responsbility for solutions thereby lying on both groups.

A2. Low vs. High Awareness of Social-Environmental Determination of Behavior of the Other Group (Teachers): the degree to which the respondent sees the behavior of teachers as attributable to social-environmental requirements placed on them (e.g., role expectations, contract duties, physical space limitations), rather than due to individual characteristics or a group stereotype of teachers.

A3. Low vs. High Awareness of Reciprocal Aggravating Behaviors: the degree to which the respondent realizes that social behavior between students and teachers is reciprocal thus leading to escalation of conflict when the behaviors are malevolent.

A4. Low vs. High Number of Basic Issues: the number of difficulties in the teacher-student relationship perceived by the respondent which relate to basic social dimensions such as power, respect and change. Basic issues coded included over-control of daily behavior, lack of decision-making power, lack of social status, lack of respect, irrelevant curriculum, outmoded and formal

Fig. 3 cont'd...

instruction, and lack of positive change.

A5. Low Complexity (Stereotypy) vs. High Complexity of Perception of the Other Group (Teachers): the degree to which the respondent perceives the teacher group as exhibiting individual variety and as a mixture of subgroups delineated on a number of dimensions such as age, sex, teaching methods and political attitudes.

A6. Low vs. High General Complexity: an overall rating on the degree to which the respondent presents a complex, detailed, and differentiated view of the teacher-student relationship and teachers as a group

B. Positiveness:

B1. Interrole Suspicion, Disrespect, Hostility vs. Interrole Trust, Respect, and Positiveness: the degree to which the respondent expresses trust, respect, and friendliness toward teachers as a group as opposed to negative expressions on these dimensions.

B2. Poor vs. Good Communication: the degree of perceived communication between students and teachers in both quantity and quality including the degree of openness and mutual exchange of genuine concerns.

B3. Coexistence, Withdrawal vs. Collaboration: the degree to which the respondent perceives the <u>present</u> relationship as an

Fig. 3 cont'd...

involving, active collaboration between students and teachers as opposed to "getting by" with the least amount of contact and open conflict.

B4. Unfavorable vs. Favorable Attitude Toward Teachers: the degree of favorability of the respondent's overall evaluation of teachers as expressed in the cognitive, affective, and behavioral areas.

B5. Positive Sentences Minus Negative Sentences: a coding category comprised of the numerical signed difference between sentences categorized as positively evaluative and sentences judged as negatively evaluative with regard to teachers.

C. Orientations:

C1. Passive, External vs. Active, Internal Mode of Changing the Relationship: the degree to which the respondent feels that students should work in active ways within the relationship and the school to bring about desirable changes.

C2. Argumentative, Coercive vs. Problem-Solving Consultive Mode of Changing the Relationship: the degree to which the respondent believes that students should take a considerate, consultive, problem-solving approach toward teachers, administrators and others in trying to improve the relationship, rather than approaching it as a contest or battle to win by force or hostile actions.

Fig. 3 cont'd...

C3. Pessimistic vs. Optimistic Regarding Future Improvements: the degree of optimism about the relationship being improved in the near future.

C4. Low vs. High Number of Common Goals and Ways of Improving the Relationship: the combined total of the perceived number of common goals that students and teachers share and the perceived number of specific ways that students and teachers could work toward reaching these goals.

C5. Low vs. High Personal Involvement and Identification with the General Problem: the degree to which the respondent feels personally involved with the teacher-student relationship and identifies with it as involving problems which affect him directly.

C6. Low vs. High Personal Agency and Commitment to Improve the Relationship: the degree to which the respondent sees himself as an active, effective agent who can influence the relationship and has a definite commitment in being directly involved in improvement efforts.

C7. Low vs. High Number of Ways of Possible Personal Involvement: the total number of ways the respondent would like to be involved in improving the relationship between students and teachers.

FIGURE 4. Study Two: The Rating Scale Definitions

A. Complexity:

A1. Low vs. High Complexity of Perceptions of the Neighbourhood: the degree to which the respondent views the neighbourhood as multidimensional in terms of persons and facilities and the extent to which he can describe a variety of complex social pressures affecting the neighbourhood over time.

A2. Low vs. High Complexity of Perception of the Relationship: the detail and sophistication of the perceptions of the housing tenant-home owner relationship as a complex, reciprocal, jointly-determined, and externally-determined social relationship involving processes such as communication, interaction, power, trust, and attraction.

A3. Number of Good Things and Difficulties in the Relationship: a numerical total of the positive aspects and the problems which the respondent perceives in the relationship between housing tenants and home owners.

A4. Low Complexity (Stereotypy) vs. High Complexity of Perception of the Other Group: the degree to which the respondent perceives the other group as a collection of unique individuals and subgroups who vary on a variety of dimensions such as age, occupation, family composition, and life style.

A5. Low vs. High Understanding of Other Group's Situation: the degree to which the respondent is able to "put himself into

Fig. 4 cont'd...

the shoes" of a member of the other group, to recognize, understand, and accepc his problems in living in his situation.

B. Positiveness

B1. Negative vs. Positive Perception of the Neighbourhood: the degree of positiveness of the respondent's perception of the neighbourhood as an appealing place to live.

B2. Negative vs. Positive Perception of the Present Relationship: the degree to which the respondent views the relationship between the groups as involving friendliness, respect, trust, good communication, and effective, cooperative interactions.

B3. Negative vs. Positive Perception of the Ideal Relationship: the degree to which the respondent would like to see the relationship involve friendliness, respect, etc.

B4. Unfavorable vs. Favorable Attitude Toward the Other Group: the degree of favorability of the respondent's overall evaluation of the other group as expressed in the cognitive, affective, and behavioral areas.

B5. Low vs. High Social Contact with the Other Group: A numerical total of the number of the other group spoken to now and then plus the number of the other group that the respondent would count as friends.

Fig. 4 cont'd...

C. Orientations:

C1. Unconstructive, Unrealistic vs. Constructive, Problem-Solving Mode of Change: the degree to which the respondent believes that useful change will come about through active, internal plus external, consultive problem-solving.

C2. Pessimistic vs. Optimistic Regarding Future Improvements: the degree to which the respondent is optimistic about the relationship and the neighbourhood being improved in the forseeable future.

C3. Low vs. High Number of Common Goals and Ways: the combined total of the number of shared goals between the groups and the number of ways they could work toward these goals to improve the neighbourhood and the relationship.

C4. Low vs. High Personal Involvement and Agency: the degree to which the respondent feels personally involved in the relationship, sees that problems affect him directly, and sees himself as an active agent who wants to be directly involved in improving the relationship and the neighbourhood.

C5. Low vs. High Number of Ways of Possible Personal Involvement: the total number of ways the respondent would like to be involved in improving the relationship and the neighbourhood.

FIGURE 5. Excerpt Rated Low on
Complexity of Perception of the Relationship (A2)

I: How do you think private home owners and public housing tenants get along with each other in the neighbourhood?

R: I don't think they get along at all. Like I said, there's no real battles, they just kind of stick to themselves and we stick to ourselves... if I walk around the block there isn't one person over there that'll say, "Hi, how are you?", "It's nice out tonight", or something. They just don't. They do make me feel uneasy.

I: What are some good things about the relationship?

R. Their houses look pretty good. They keep them that way. It kind of helps this area where they won't led us do anything. Their yards are beautiful. They're always complaining about how horrible it looks around here. ...I think they could help us a lot if they wanted to. Like I said, they know people in town which the majority of people here don't, they could do a lot of things for us if they wanted to. But there's just no communication at all that anything can be done. Like I said, they have families. We could use the babysitting money. But, we couldn't babysit for them. We don't mind our own kids so we can't mind theirs, which to me is unfair...

I: What are some difficulties in the relationship?

R. They both go to the same schools. I find it hard for my daughter, the way I dress here. I mean it's not my fault I can't afford better

Fig. 5 cont'd...

clothes or brand new clothes. Yet she'll go to school and she'll say "So-and-so got a new dress. Mommy, she got another new dress this week." ...and it's kind of hard to explain to a seven year old, "Well, I don't have the money to buy you this."...You can't compete. You know, you just don't have the money to compete in any way with them. And, of course, they mark it down to the fact that we're all ignorant and stupid, and like to be on welfare which isn't true either. So, it's something that makes for bad feelings and it is kind of hard.

I: What do you think causes these problems?

R. A lack of money. I think that's the main thing.

FIGURE 6. Excerpt Rated High on Complexity of Perception of the Relationship (A2) and Rated Low on Positiveness of Perception of the Relationship (B2)

I: How do you think private home owners and public housing tenants get along with each other in the neighbourhood?

R: They don't. I don't think they bother with one another. ...I don't know that they're out there viciously fighting. There may be one or two cases, but I think they just stay away from one another, ignore one another. ...I think both groups do, and I think it's done fairly intentionally.

I: What are some good things about the relationship?

R: I can't think of any. ...I've made some friends...some enemies. ...The (neighbourhood committee), that's a mixture and...they work together there, that's about the only concrete thing that's happening between them. And that's at an organized level — it's at a higher level than just on the street. ...the community center is working towards some positive things, and hopefully that will be an integrated thing.

I: What are some difficulties in the relationship?

R: I don't know if it's people's ego or what, but there are some difficulties and probably the worst sufferers are the children. The children are not allowed here or they're told certain things that make them aware that there are two different groups. Children shouldn't be aware of that. You know, I would hope that in a perfect

Fig. 6 cont'd...

society they would not be aware that there were groupings and there were different classes of people. But, I think the children in this neighbourhood are definitely aware.

...Like the incident at the park: "You welfare people can't use the baseball diamond. It's here for us tax-paying home owners." And I thought if that didn't damage all children, certainly it was leading to it. I didn't think it was fair for an adult to force that opinion on a child but that's what was happening.

I think a lot more could be happening in a constructive and fun way...if we could get over that hurdle.

I: What do you think causes these problems?

R: Misunderstanding, or lack of empathy, I guess, to get out of your own space and say, "What if it was me." And that's probably on both sides. I think people in public housing are there because of financial difficulty and they look at the private home owners and say, "He couldn't possibly have any problems," but he does. ...But, you know, our problems-financial problems - seem to outweigh all the others. They've got all out of proportion and I wish that wasn't so. ...But, I think finances have, and I don't think that's unique to this neighbourhood. I think that's predominant throughout the whole area, throughout the... (I: Throughout the whole society?) Yeah. That money is the strength and the power and the desireable,

Fig. 6 cont'd...

and I wish that would change, and if that would change, I think a lot of other things would fall into better perspective.

FIGURE 7. Excerpt Rated High on Positiveness of Perception of the Relationship (B2)

I: How do you think private home owners and public housing tenants get along with each other in the neighbourhood?

R: Well, I think lumping them (the public housing units) is a problem because any problems that have arisen in the past year or two were on an individual basis —and...were primarily concerned with people who were trying to sell their homes. Home owners who were trying to sell and were encountering problems. I know my immediate neighbour had their house up for sale and on several occassions potential buyers said in outright terms that they would not buy opposite from public housing. ...Now, when we bought our house we knew what we were moving into, but it didn't matter because they (the public housing units) were quite decent attractive homes. ...So, as I say, if there is a problem I don't think it's a group problem. I don't think it's a matter of us ganging up on our side of the street and them ganging up on the other and shouting at each other or anything like that. It's not a group hostility. And I don't even think when it comes down to individuals that it's an individual against another individual because that person rents and I own. It's a general unhappiness because of the stigma that has been built up around grouping so many public houses together.

I: What are some good things about the relationship?

Fig. 7 cont'd...

R: Well, for myself the people that live across the street just happen to be people that live across the street. ...I know them just as if they were any neighbours, because they are. You make friends with people. I don't have any preconceived notion about who I should be friends with. ...Not too many people do. ...I think ...a good thing that has come out is that the community itself has got together. Finally there are two (neighbourhood committees). They are two groups but they even seem to be getting together on a lot of things which are benefitting everybody. The summer program for children, particularly, the teen age drop-in centre, all those kinds of activities that don't immediately affect one because of my family, but which certainly seems to be benefitting ...both groups (tenants and home owners).

I: What are some difficulties in the relationship?

R: I don't know. I think you have a different attitude if you own your own home, attitude toward your community, because, let's face it, you're stuck there for a while and you want it to get better for yourselves and for everybody else. Whereas, if you're renting ...you tend to be transient — not transient to the point where you're here today and gone tomorrow, but let's face it, a lot of the people in public housing ... are going to move on. ...They don't ever really develop a community identity. Mind you, a lot of them have been there for years. My best friend lived in a (public housing

Fig. 7 cont'd...

unit) ever since they opened.

FIGURE 8. Excerpt Rated Low on Personal Involvement (C4)

I: Would you like to be involved in bringing about a better relationship?

R: Yes, I wouldn't mind, but my limited dealing with people, being a little more of an intoverted type than a lot of others, you know. I would like to try, but I really have no clue how. I would have to have an awful lot of help.

I: Do you think that you will be involved in any ways in the neighbourhood that you aren't now?

R: That's hard to say, not knowing what's going to happen. If I'm going to make a try, ...

I: If someone approached you for any kind of involvement, would you be willing to do anything?

R: If I thought it was something I could help with. Like I wouldn't like to promise my help to someone if I knew absolutely nothing about what they asked me to help. I feel if I am going to help other people (I want) to contribute something of value.

FIGURE 9. Excerpt Rated High on Personal Involvement (C4)

I: Would you like to be involved in bringing about a better relationship?

R: Oh yeah. I think I am involved in that in a lot of the things I do. I hope that part of what I'm doing is that in how I spend my time and the kinds of things I do. When I look at the community center and the neighbourhood committee and the human service project, I think that's probably one of my goals.

I: Do you think that you will be involved in any ways in the neighbourhood that you aren't now?

R: I don't know, different from what I am now? Probably not a great deal of different other things. I'll be maybe better equipped to work in the neighbourhood as I — as you gain more experience and meet more people and learn the shortcuts and avoid the stumbling blocks, you become more effective. I don't know, I don't foresee any different capacity. I'm not suddenly going to go from volunteer to professional overnight.

I: In what ways, do you want to get involved in the future?

R: Um, just by being part of it, helping in the planning, by working for the end result, by being asked for my opinion, which is basically what I have been in the past. By helping someone else understand my opinion and being able to listen to their opinion. I don't see myself as any great leader in social change. I think that social change comes very gradual.

Fig. 9 cont'd...

I: Yeah, but you are part of it?

R: Yeah, and I hope to remain part of it.

Table 1

Interrater Reliabilities for the Rating Dimensions and Coding Categories Study One N=32

Dimension or Category	Pretest r	Pretest S-B	Posttest r	Posttest S-B
Complexity:				
A1. Awareness of joint causality	.56	.72	.73	.84
A2. Awareness of social determination	.68	.81	.78	.88
A3. Awareness of reciprocal behaviors	.74	.85	.58	.73
A4. Number of basic issues	.55	.71	.57	.73
A5. Complexity of perception of the other group	.60	.75	.58	.73
A6. General complexity	.67	.80	.79	.88
TOTAL COMPLEXITY	.72	.84	.76	.86
Positiveness:				
B1. Degree of interrater respect	.81	.90	.85	.92
B2. Effectiveness of communication	.47	.64	.54	.70
B3. Degree of collaboration	.36	.53	.52	.68
B4. Favorability of attitude	.79	.88	.85	.92
B5. Sentence difference	.82	.90	.82	.90
TOTAL POSITIVENESS	.78	.88	.85	.92
Orientations:				
C1. Degree of active mode	.62	.77	.41	.58
C2. Degree of problem-solving mode	.03	.04	.43	.60
C3. Degree of optimism	.73	.84	.58	.73
C4. Number of common goals and ways	.48	.65	.02	.04
C5. Degree of personal involvement	.44	.61	.61	.76
C6. Degree of personal agency	.86	.93	.77	.87
C7. Number of ways of involvement	.88	.94	.49	.66
TOTAL ORIENTATIONS	.72	.84	.41	.58

Table 2

Interrater Reliabilities for the Rating Dimensions and Coding Categories Study Two N=20

Dimension or Category	r	S-B
Complexity		
A1. Complexity of perception of the neighbourhood	.61	.76
A2. Complexity of perception of the relationship	.57	.73
A3. Number of good things and difficulties	.59	.74
A4. Complexity of perception of the other group	.65	.79
A5. Degree of understanding of other group's situation	.71	.83
TOTAL COMPLEXITY	.75	.86
Positiveness:		
B1. Positiveness of perception of the neighbourhood	.68	.81
B2. Positiveness of perception of the relationship	.86	.93
B3. Positiveness of perception of ideal relationship	.51	.68
B4. Favorability of attitude	.80	.89
B5. Number of social contacts	.99	.99
TOTAL POSITIVENESS	.95	.97
Orientations		
C1. Degree of problem-solving mode	.67	.80
C2. Degree of optimism	.81	.90
C3. Number of common goals and ways	.92	.96
C4. Degree of personal involvement and agency	.84	.91
C5. Number of ways of involvement	.90	.95
TOTAL ORIENTATIONS	.90	.95

Table 3

Item-Total Correlations for Study One (N=32)
and Study Two (N=27)

Study	Rating Area and Dimension							
	Complexity							
	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6		Mean
One	.79	.44	.78	.25	.33	.92		.59
Two	.38	.53	.51	.62	.66			.54
	Positiveness							
	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5			Mean
One	.91	.57	.51	.87	.93			.76
Two	.48	.56	.51	.21	.75			.50
	Orientations							
	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	Mean
One	.81	.42	.23	.56	.75	.75	.39	.56
Two	.62	.79	.79	.89	.86			.79

$p < .05$ (N=32)=.34

$p < .05$ (N=27)=.36

Table 4

Correlations Among the Total Scores for the Rating Areas Study One (N=32) and Study Two (N=27)

Rating Area	Study One -			Study Two		
	A	B	C	A	B	C
A. Complexity		.22	.36		.00	.36
B. Positiveness			.00			.17
C. Orientations						

$p < .05$ (N=32) = .34

$p < .05$ (N=27) = .36

Table 5

Factor Analysis Study One N=32

Ratings and Total Scores	Factor and Factor Loadings						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Complexity:							
A1		.85					
A2		.36		.54	-.49		
A3		.78	.31				
A4							
A5				.76			-.65
A6		.92					
Total		.94					
Positiveness:							
B1	.90						
B2	.44	.32			.67		
B3	.30		.41		.74		
B4	.89						
B5	.89						
Total	.93						
ATTS	.72			-.39			
SDT	.70						
Orientations:							
C1			.77				
C2						.86	
C3							.82
C4			.34			.65	-.31
C5	-.31	.34	.66		.47		
C6			.90				
C7		.32	.58			-.54	
Total			.87			.38	
Cumulative Proportion of Variance	.27	.46	.56	.65	.73	.78	.82

Table 6

Factor Analysis Study Two N=27

Ratings and Total Scores	Factors and Factor Loadings					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Complexity						
A1				.68		
A2	.35					.81
A3				-.33	.70	
A4					.34	.69
A5					.74	
Total					.78	.53
Positiveness:						
B1		.91				
B2		.80				
B3			.33	.73		
B4		.44				.36
B5			.96			
Total		.58	.76			
Orientations						
C1				.81		
C2	.82					
C3	.87					
C4	.73			.53		
C5	.68			.54		
Total	.86			.48		
Cumulative Proportion of Variance	.31	.46	.59	.66	.73	.79

References

Baron, R.A., Byrne, D. & Griffitt, W. Social Psychology: Understanding Human Interaction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974.

Bem, D.H. Beliefs, Attitudes, and Human Affairs. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1970.

Fisher, R.J. Third party consultation: A method for the study and resolution of conflict, Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1972, 16, 67-94 (a).

Fisher, R.J. Third party consultation between high school students and teachers (Volumes 1 & 2). Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1972 (b).

Fisher, R.J. & White, J.H. Reducing tensions between neighbourhood housing groups: A pilot study in third party consultation, In Press.

Guilford, J.P. Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.

Insko, C.A. & Schopler, J. Experimental Social Psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1972.

Jones, E.E. & Gerard, H.B. Foundations of Social Psychology. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Katz, D. & Stotland, E. A preliminary statement to a theory of attitude structure and change. In S. Koch (Ed.) Psychology: A Study of a Science, Volume 3. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959, 423-475.

Krech, D., Crutchfield, R.S. & Ballachey, E.L. Individual in Society: A Textbook of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Rosenberg, M.J. An analysis of affective-cognitive consistency. In M.J. Rosenberg, C.I. Hovland, W.J. McGuire, R.P. Abelson & J.W. Brehm (Eds.), Attitude Organization and Change. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1960, 15-64.

Scott, W.A. Attitude measurement. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of Social Psychology, Volume 2. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1968, 204-273.

Footnotes

1. For helpful comments on earlier drafts of this article, the author wishes to thank Raphael S. Ezekiel, Donald G. Fischer, Daniel S. Sydiaha-Symor, and James H. White.

2. Copies of the Rating Manual are available from the author, or alternatively, could be filed with the American Documentation Institute.